

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

PAUL CHIGAL,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHARLES DANIEL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:20-cv-00455-GMN-WGC

ORDER

On August 7, 2020, this Court issued an order directing Plaintiff to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee of \$400 on or before October 6, 2020. (ECF No. 3 at 2). On September 16, 2020, Plaintiff filed an application to proceed *in formal pauperis*. (ECF No. 4). Plaintiff's application at ECF No. 4 is incomplete, as it does not include the required Financial Certificate. The October 6, 2020 deadline has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or paid the full \$400 filing fee.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal" of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming

1 dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421,
2 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with
3 local rules).

4 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey
5 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:
6 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to
7 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring
8 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.
9 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at
10 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

11 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously
12 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of
13 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of
14 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay
15 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*
16 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring
17 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
18 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey
19 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"
20 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779
21 F.2d at 1424.

22 The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file a fully complete application to proceed
23 *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee on or before October 6, 2020 expressly stated:
24 "IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Plaintiff does not file a fully complete application to
25 proceed *in forma pauperis* with all three documents or pay the full \$400 filing fee for a
26 civil action on or before October 6, 2020, the Court will dismiss this action without
27 prejudice for Plaintiff to refile the case with the Court, under a new case number, when
28 Plaintiff has all three documents needed to file a complete application to proceed *in forma*

1 *pauperis* or pays the full \$400 filing fee." (ECF No. 3 at 3). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate
2 warning that dismissal would result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file
3 a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee on or
4 before October 6, 2020.

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is dismissed without prejudice
6 based on Plaintiff's failure to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*
7 or pay the full \$400 filing fee in compliance with this Court's order dated August 7, 2020.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Plaintiff's incomplete application to proceed
9 *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 4) is denied as moot.

10 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment
11 accordingly and close this case. No additional documents will be filed in this now closed
12 case.

13 DATED: October 17, 2020

14
15 
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28